

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are presently pending.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (SIDS) is being filed concurrently herewith. Entry of the SIDS is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner again rejected Claims 17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sarkisian *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,923).

Independent Claim 17 has been amended to recite "an overlay removably attachable to the first surface in a first position and the second surface in a second position of the main body." The overlay in one embodiment of the present invention is removably attachable to a first surface of the main body, for example, a front surface, and to a second surface of the main body, for example, a back surface or storage position.

For example, as shown in Figure 3 of the present application, fasteners 26 are used to removably secure the overlay 22 to a first surface 16 of main body 12 and a second surface 30 of the main body 12. In this manner, the overlay 22 is secured, *i.e.*, firmly fastened, to the main body 12. With the overlay 22 removably attachable to the main body, the sign 10 can be stored in any orientation and the overlay will remain attached to the sign.

In contrast, a storage pocket for storing the overlay as disclosed in Sarkisian *et al.* does not removably secure the overlay to the sign as recited by Claim 17 of the present application. Thus, if the sign in Sarkisian *et al.* is not stored in an upright position, the overlay could fall out of the storage pocket. Additionally, a storage pocket adds weight to the sign, making it more difficult to move around. Accordingly, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 depends directly from independent Claim 17, and thus includes the aforementioned patentable distinction over Sarkisian *et al.*

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Dinan *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,212,898).

Claim 20 depends from Claim 17, and thus includes the limitation of "an overlay removably attachable to the first surface in a first position and a second surface in a second position at the main body." As set forth above, Sarkisian *et al.* do not disclose this limitation. It is respectfully submitted that Dinan *et al.* fail to remedy this deficiency. In particular, Dinan *et al.* disclose a sign construction 10 that includes a pair of base sheets 11, 12 that are attachable to a pole. Overlay sheet material 61, 62 are attachable over the base sheets 11, 12 with ties 50 (FIG. 5F) or by plastic bolt member 70 (FIGS. 6 and 7). Dinan *et al.* do not disclose an overlay that is removably attachable to a first surface of a main body in a first position and a second surface of the main body in a second position. Dinan *et al.* disclose overlays 61, 62 attachable to the outer surfaces of the base sheets 11, 12.

Accordingly, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10, 12-14, 18, 19, 22, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,173,026).

As discussed above, Sarkisian *et al.* fail to teach or suggest removably attaching an overlay to a first surface and a second surface of a main body. Cordola *et al.* fail to remedy this deficiency. That is, Cordola *et al.* disclose a clip for fixing a panel 17 to a support 18 in which the clip includes a body 1 having a head 2 adapted to be mounted to the panel through an orifice 19, a foot 3 adapted to be mounted to the support through an orifice 20, and a flange at the place where the foot 3 and the head merge 2. A relatively soft plastic material washer cooperates with

the flange 4 to provide a seal with a support. There is no teaching or suggestion of removably attaching an overlay to a first second surface of a main body.

Accordingly, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.*, and further in view of admitted prior art (APA).

Claim 11 depends directly from Claim 1, and thus includes the patentable distinction over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.* as discussed above. The alleged APA fails to remedy the deficiency noted with respect to Sarkisian *et al.* and Cordola *et al.*

Accordingly, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected Claims 15, 16, 23-28, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.*, and further in view of Dinan *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,212,898).

Claim 15 depends directly from Claim 1, and thus includes the patentable distinction over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.* as discussed above. It is respectfully submitted that Dinan *et al.* fail to remedy the deficiencies of Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.* Again, Dinan *et al.* do not disclose an overlay that is attachable to a first surface of a main body in a first position and a second surface of the main body in a second position.

Independent Claims 16 and 23 contain similar limitations and thus this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.*, in view of Dinan *et al.*, and further in view of the admitted prior art (APA).

Claim 29 depends directly from Claim 23, which recites patentable subject matter over Sarkisian *et al.* in view of Cordola *et al.*, in view of Dinan *et al.*, as discussed above. It is respectfully submitted that the alleged APA fails to remedy the deficiencies of these references.

Accordingly, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

Erik L. Ence

Registration No. 42,511

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, Massachusetts 01742-9133

Dated: August 27, 2003